

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are now in this application. Claim 1 has been amended.

The drawings were objected to for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they drawings and description were in conflict. In particular, the drawings disclose DSC 14 whereas the description discloses DSC 16. The description has been amended to disclose DSC 14.

Claim 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Sonetaka (US 6,591,107). Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitation of a “method of sharing supplemental channel resources in a system utilizing open assignment and open waiting states for responding to a resource request.” Support for the recitation can be found at page 8, lines 1-9. By contrast, Sonetaka does not disclose nor suggest open assignment nor open waiting states for responding to a resource request as taught in the present application. Accordingly, it is felt that claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Sonetaka.

Claims 2-9 depend upon, and include all the limitations of, claim 1 and, thus, are also felt to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Sonetaka.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonetaka in view of Vanderspool, II et al (US 5,261,118). Applicant respectfully traverses for the reason discussed above. Accordingly, it is felt that claim 10 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sonetaka in view of Vanderspool, II et al.

Based upon the foregoing reasons, applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully,
Dan Anthony Balogh
John K Burgess
Roger T Kiang
Stan Vitebsky

By 
Jimmy Goo, Esq.
Reg. No. 36,528
(973) 386-6377

Date: November 30, 2004

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Holmdel, NJ 07733-3030